



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/854,977	05/14/2001	Scott LeKuch	YOR920000703US1	9087

7590

03/17/2006

Harry F. Smith, Esq.  
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.  
10th Floor  
One Landmark Square  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682

EXAMINER

VO, HUYEN X

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2655

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/854,977

Applicant(s)

LEKUCH ET AL.

Examiner

Huyen X. Vo

Art Unit

2655

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 May 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments, filed 1/3/2006, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Funyu anticipates all the limitations above in that the "language element" is the "document media", which includes a text message, downloaded to the client device. The client device then requests the server to download appropriate fonts to the client device for displaying the "document media" on the client device (see col. 7, line 45 to col. 8 line 67). The only feature that Funyu fails to disclose is the that the client device does not convert character codes to graphic elements before presenting said bitmap as a full screen image on said display device. However, Marmor teaches this feature. Thus, examiner maintains previous ground of rejection.

2. With respect to applicant's argument regarding combination of Funyu and Marmor, Marmor is only relied upon for the teaching of a remote converter for converting incompatible portions of the HTML file for the client device. "Language element" is taught by Funyu reference (see *argument above*).

3. With respect to applicant's argument regarding bit maps of language element, image of each character displayed on the client device is bit maps of language element.

4. With respect to applicant's argument regarding the server having program instructions that enable the server to select language element, documents containing

Art Unit: 2655

language elements are selected based on input request and forwarded to the client device (*col. 7, lines 45-67*).

5. With respect to applicant's argument regarding the client stores an image representation of the language element for later use, downloaded fonts are stored at the client device for subsequent use (*figure 1A*). Fonts include unique style of character's representation or image.

6. With respect to applicant's argument regarding the date of Korpela, the date cited may have been the date the website got updated. ASCII code and Unicode codes were well-known inventions long before the filing date of the present application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-4, 8, 11-14, 18, 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Funyu (US 6320587) in view of Marmor (US 6601108).

Art Unit: 2655

9. As per claims 1, 11, and 21, Funyu discloses the following limitations: a communication link for bi-directionally providing a communication channel between a host computing device and a companion computing device (*communication network - 34, FIG. 2a*); said companion computing device comprising a display and further comprising a control device for transmitting a request for a language element to said host computing device over said communication link (*www client (35, FIG. 2a) comprising display (62e, FIG. 2b) and inherently comprising a processor which makes a request to download the fonts over the computer network (col. 7, lines 58-62)*); host computing device being responsive to a receipt of said request for a language element for transmitting to said companion computing device an image representation (*bitmap, FIG. 6*) of the requested language element over said communication link for display on said companion display device (*WWW server, (31, FIG. 2a) which downloads fonts to the client device (Col. 7, lines 58-62)*), wherein said language element being a symbol representative of a complete message to be presented as part of the user interface of the companion device, wherein said message is comprised of either multiple characters of arbitrary language, character set or a graphic icon (*col. 8, line 59 to col. 9, line 25, referring to the Response to Amendment section for explanation*), wherein said complete message is formatted for display device and comprises bitmap (*font conversion, Col. 7, lines 58-62*).

Funyu fails to specifically disclose that the companion computing device, without conversion from character codes to graphic elements, presents said bit map as a full screen image on said display device. However, Marmor teaches a remote converter for

Art Unit: 2655

converting incompatible portions of the HTML file for the client device (*figure 1A and/or referring to col. 9, lines 34-67*).

Since Funyu and Marmor are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Funyu by incorporating the teaching of Marmor in order to support resource-limited client device to display multiple languages.

10. As per claims 2, 4, 14, 12, and 22, Funyu further discloses a server (host computer) with database (storing unit, 32, FIG. 2a), which stores font data in a bitmap (image) representation (bitmap data, FIG. 6) or character code representation (character code, FIG. 6).

11. As per claims 3, and 13, Funyu further discloses that a database stores fonts of other foreign languages (Col. 9, lines 11-17).

12. As per claims 8, 18, and 23, Funyu further discloses storing fonts on the client machine (Col. 8, lines 2-4).

13. Claims 5-7, 15-17, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Funyu (US 6320587) in view of Marmor (US 6601108), and further in view of Korpela (<http://www.cs.tut.fi/~jkorpela/chars.html>).

Art Unit: 2655

14. As per claims 5-7, 15-17, and 24, Funyu discloses a server (host device) dynamically creating font resources (image/bitmap representation) corresponding to character media data (Col. 5, lines 60-63). As shown in FIG. 6, the result of such conversion is a font comprising a bitmap (image) representation of a character.

Funyu does not explicitly disclose that the language elements (character media data) are stored in textual form, as ASCII or Unicode codes. However, FIG. 6 does show that the resulting fonts contain character codes. Korpela teaches that the text codes, such as ASCII and Unicode and their corresponding conversion to images (bitmaps) are extremely well known in the art. (See Jukka Korpela, "A tutorial on character code issues", <http://www.cs.tut.fi/~jkorpela/chars.html>). In addition, font data of Funyu already contains textual codes (character codes, FIG. 6) and hence, the server must necessarily have this information on hand during the creation of font resources.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Funyu and Marmor to create font resources from text (ASCII, Unicode, etc, as suggested by Korpela), because this method is notoriously well-known in the art and would allow Funyu's system to offload the process of font data creation from the computationally weaker client machines to a dedicated server (Col. 6, lines 19-25).

Art Unit: 2655

15. Claims 9-10 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Funyu (US 6320587) in view of Marmor (US 6601108), and further in view of Official Notice.

16. As per claims 9 and 19, Funyu does not disclose that a companion computing device comprises a digitizer input system having an electronic pen or stylus for handwritten information. However, Funyu does suggest that a user terminal can be a PDA (Col. 2, lines 14-16). The examiner takes the official notice that it is extremely well known that a typical PDA comprises an electronic pen/stylus for the input of handwritten information.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Funyu and Marmor to use a PDA with a styluses/electronic pens, as these are exactly the limited capacity processing devices that his invention attempts to improve (Col. 6, lines 19-25) by offloading font processing to dedicated servers.

17. As per claims 10, and 20, Funyu does not explicitly disclose a communication link (network), which is either wireless or wired (wire-line). However, Funyu further discloses a network, such as LAN, connecting a client and a server (Col. 9, lines 55-61). The examiner takes the official notice that both wireless (802.1 1b) and wire-line LANS (Ethernet) are extremely well known in the art.



Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Funyu and Marmor to use either wireless or wire-line network, as this is well-known in the art and would ensure that Funyu's system would operate with both wireless (laptops) and wire-line (desktops, workstations, etc.) environments.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huyen X. Vo whose telephone number is 571-272-7631. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571-272-7602. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2655

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HXV

3/7/2006

\*\*\*

  
RICHEMOND DORVIL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER